

Supplementary Table S2. Analyses in the 291-participant overlap sample

Outcome	Model	Sample detail	PWE – HC β (95% CI)	p
Mean set size	355 — base OLS	PWE 222 / HC 133	–0.249 (–0.368 to –0.131)	<0.001
	291 — base OLS	PWE 198 / HC 93	–0.310 (–0.444 to –0.176)	<0.001
	291 — education-adjusted OLS	n = 291	–0.251 (–0.380 to –0.122)	<0.001
K4, items	355 — base OLS	PWE 209 / HC 130	–0.363 (–0.584 to –0.142)	0.001
	291 — base OLS	PWE 186 / HC 93	–0.359 (–0.613 to –0.106)	0.006
	291 — education-adjusted OLS	n = 279	–0.317 (–0.571 to –0.063)	0.015
Accuracy	355 — base LMM	PWE 222 / HC 133	–0.067 (–0.102 to –0.033)	<0.001
	291 — base LMM	PWE 198 / HC 93	–0.071 (–0.110 to –0.031)	<0.001
	291 — education-adjusted LMM	n = 291	–0.051 (–0.089 to –0.014)	0.007
Response time, ms	355 — base LMM	PWE 222 / HC 133	79.50 (27.57 to 131.43)	0.003
	291 — base LMM	PWE 198 / HC 93	85.85 (25.50 to 146.21)	0.005
	291 — education-adjusted LMM	n = 291	77.68 (16.69 to 138.66)	0.013
	291 — education + prosaccade latency	n = 291	65.07 (2.66 to 127.48)	0.041
Final gaze-to-target distance, deg	355 — base LMM	PWE 222 / HC 133	0.253 (0.128 to 0.379)	<0.001
	291 — base LMM	PWE 198 / HC 93	0.310 (0.164 to 0.457)	<0.001
	291 — education-adjusted LMM	n = 291	0.272 (0.126 to 0.417)	<0.001
	291 — education + prosaccade spatial error	n = 291	0.236 (0.090 to 0.382)	0.002

Note. The 291-participant overlap sample comprises participants with available data from both the current visual working memory task and the previously reported saccadic task battery. β values represent PWE minus HC; negative values indicate lower values in PWE, whereas positive values indicate higher values in PWE. Model sequence for each outcome: (i) full-sample (n = 355) base model; (ii) 291-participant base model; (iii) 291-participant education-adjusted model; and, where applicable, (iv) 291-participant education-adjusted model with the corresponding saccadic measure. Response time was additionally adjusted for prosaccade latency and final gaze-to-target distance for prosaccade spatial error; no saccadic covariate was included for mean set size, K4, or accuracy. Outcomes with a single value per participant (mean set size, K4) were analyzed by ordinary least squares; outcomes with one value per participant at each set size were analyzed with linear mixed-effects models, Outcome ~ Group $\times$ (Size – 4) + (1 | participant), consistent with the main text. For the mixed-effects models, the group estimate is the PWE – HC difference at set size 4. Within the overlap subset, K4 was available for 279 participants (186 PWE and 93 HC), because accuracy at set size 4 was not available for every participant. P values in this sensitivity analysis were unadjusted and were interpreted descriptively.